

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph Thomas Booth,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 0:21-cv-1466-BHH
v.	)	
	)	
Bryan P. Stirling, <i>Director S.C.D.C.</i> ,	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Joseph Thomas Booth’s (“Plaintiff”) pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 10, 2022, Defendant Bryan P. Stirling filed a motion for summary judgment, and the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.).

On March 24, 2022, Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett issued a report and recommendation (“Report”), outlining the issues and recommending that the Court dismiss this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because Plaintiff lacks standing. Attached to the Magistrate Judge’s Report was a notice advising the parties of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole

or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no party has filed objections to the Report, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s thorough analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 95) in full and specifically incorporates it herein, and the Court grants Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 79) and dismisses this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because Plaintiff lacks standing to bring this action.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

April 13, 2022  
Charleston, South Carolina